PATENT

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1795/303912.01

Application No.: 10/608,298

Office Action Dated: January 27, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application, all of which stand rejected as a result of the January 27, 2006 Office Action. In particular, claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2004/0002958 (Seshadri). Following entry of the amendment, claims 1 and 11 will have been amended (solely to correct typographical oversight, and not to overcome any ground for rejection).

For the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse the rejection.

Section 102 Rejection

The independent claims of this application recite features relating to the joining of a template with a parameter table. While the independent claims are not identical in either language or scope, applicants note that the independent claims recite the following features:

- Claim 1 recites: "performing a join between said parameter table and parameterized subscription template to generate a query"
- Claim 11 recites: "wherein the parameter table is joined with the subscription template to generate a notification query"
- Claim 20 recites: "joining the parameter table with the query templates to generate a notification query"

These features are not taught or suggested in the applied portions of Seshadri.¹

As to the above-quoted features of claims 1, 11, and 20, the Examiner has variously cited paragraphs 0271, 0272, 0401, and 0402. While the terms "templates" and "parameters" do appear in the cited paragraphs, what the Examiner has overlooked is that claims 1, 11, and 20 do not merely mention a template and a parameter; rather, these claims recite: (1) a join, (2) between a template and a parameter table, (3) to generate a query. Items (1), (2), and (3) are not taught or suggested by the applied paragraphs' mere mention of "templates" and "parameters."

¹ Applicants note that the section 102 rejection focuses on how specific paragraphs of Seshadri are applied to specific claim features. Since applicant seeks to directly address the issues raised by the Examiner, applicants have addressed specifically whether the bullet-point claim features listed above are taught by the paragraphs of Seshadri that have been cited against them. Applicants comments with respect to these features should not in any way be understood as a general characterization of the Seshadri reference as a whole.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1795/303912.01

Application No.: 10/608,298

Office Action Dated: January 27, 2006

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to paragraphs 0050-0057 of the present application. In those paragraphs, it is explained that, in many cases, queries differ from each other only in certain parameter values – e.g., in paragraph 0051, there are show two queries that different from each only in that the SQL "where" clause of one tests for "user.name = 'Joe'" and the "where" clause of the other tests for "user.name = 'Jack'". In this example, the terms 'Joe' and 'Jack' can be treated as parameters, and moved to a table of parameters. Thus, a single, template with a placeholder for the value of user.name can be created, and the actual query can be created by joining the query table with the template. As is know in the art, a "join" is a term in the database field that refers to a type of operation; the join is described in paragraph 0048 and Figure 5 (element 550) of the present application.

When the claim features quoted in the bullet-points above are read in light of the above-described material from the specification, it is clear that the applied paragraphs of Seshadri do not teach or suggest the quoted claim features. It is clear that the applied paragraphs of Seshadri refer to templates for tables, and do not describe a join between a template and a parameter table to create a query. At a minimum, the applied paragraphs of Seshadri do not suggest that a query is created by joining a template with parameters. For at least this reason, the independent claims differ from Seshadri as applied.

Since the independent claims have been shown to differ from Seshadri as applied, it is clear that the Seshadri does not teach every feature of these claims. Thus, Seshadri as applied does not anticipate the claims.

While the Examiner has based the rejection entirely on anticipation and not on obviousness, applicants note the following: If the Examiner determines to withdraw the anticipation rejection and attempts to assert a case of obviousness in a subsequent office action, applicants note that both the present application and Seshadri are assigned to Microsoft Corporation, and thus it is unlikely that Seshadri would be available to support an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

For the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11, and 20 are patentable over Seshadri as applied. Additionally, claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-26 are patentable at least by reason of dependency. Applicants thus request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-26.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1795/303912.01

Application No.: 10/608,298

Office Action Dated: January 27, 2006

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to address typographical oversights. No new matter is introduced. The amendments do not change the scope or substance of claims 1 or 11. Should the Examiner choose to cite different art in a subsequent office action, applicants note that it would be incorrect to state that the amendments to claims 1 or 11 have necessitated new grounds for rejection, since the amendments to claims 1 and 11 do not affect these claims' scope or substance.

Specification Amendment

Paragraph 0039, which is part of the description of Figure 2, has been amended so that the reference numerals in Figure 2 conform to the description in paragraph 0039. The amendment to paragraph 0039 addresses only typographical oversights. No new matter is introduced by the amendment to paragraph 0039.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance.

Date: April 27, 2006

Peter M. Ullman Registration No. 43,963 **PATENT**

Woodcock Washburn LLP One Liberty Place - 46th Floor Philadelphia PA 19103 Telephone: (215) 568-3100

Facsimile: (215) 568-3439